

Monday and Crime

Chief Justice Laws of District Court has taken a step consistent with the cause of law and even-handed justice in his determination that war veterans should have the benefit of psychiatric examinations in crimes possibly traceable to war psychosis.

It is only right that men who have gone through the harrowing ordeal of combat—who were, as the Chief Justice put it, "taught to seize, kill, assault, burn and destroy"—should have full opportunity, through competent counsel, to present their war records to the court as having a possible bearing on their actions. Justice Laws cites one case in which he saved a young veteran from the electric chair by ordering a psychiatric examination, which proved the former soldier's combat experiences had made him insane.

Nor is this an isolated case. Newspapers have carried numerous stories of war-crazed veterans running amok on their return to peacetime pursuits. The same page of The Star which reported Justice Laws' attitude in such cases coincidentally told of the confession by a soldier that he "possibly" was guilty of the so-called "Black Dahlia" murder in California. The soldier wore the combat infantryman's badge and four battle stars. If the soldier's guilt is proved, it is only just that the court should consider whether his duties as a soldier had permanently twisted his mind.

The problem of the law enforcement officer is complicated, of course, by the fact that some criminals seek to make unfair use of the war as an excuse for seeking freedom or leniency. But, here, too, the psychiatrist can aid the cause of justice by helping the court to decide between feigned "war nerves" and the real thing. Psychiatry thus can strengthen the administration of impartial justice by exposing the faker as well as protecting the innocent victim of war-induced mental illness. This whole undertaking is one in which Veterans' Administration psychiatrists well might join in protection not only of the interest of veterans, but of the public interest as well.

Portal-to-Portal Balloon

That hissing sound heard around the country yesterday was the hot air escaping from the magnificent portal-to-portal pay balloon, following Judge Picard's decision in the curious Mount Clemens Pottery case. The balloon was not altogether deflated. But the brass tack of fact, in the form of walking time per minute of workers on their way to the day's task, disposes of the time being of the case at issue and releases a lot of other thin hopes wrapped up in that case. So solid are the facts that the judge dug up for the Supreme Court, in accordance with his instructions, that it is difficult to believe they can be successfully attacked.

But there remains a job for Congress to do in supplying a clear-cut definition of compensable working time within the Wages and Hours Act. That might be accomplished by concurrent resolution, but it would be more effectively done by clarifying amendment of the law itself. For the substance of most of the portal-to-portal litigation is uncertainties over what Congress and the courts have in mind, and if these are removed most of the litigation will dissolve.

In the course of his decision, however, Judge Picard delivered himself of one opinion which is as important, if upheld, as the facts submitted regarding the "small things" with which the law is not concerned.

That regards retroactivity, on which many of the instigators of portal-to-portal suits have based their hopes for a bonanza of fantastic sums. Judge Picard holds that employers who have made an honest effort to follow the Administrator's interpretations of the Wage-Hour Act should not be penalized by retroactive damages if a court of law lays down another and conflicting interpretation. For employers who have made no effort to comply, there is another story. But "one should be protected for past acts done in good faith. Otherwise there can be no stability in an industrial world when tomorrow may see some new interpretation of the work week that would disrupt our entire economic structure. . . . We ought to have in mind always that we are in great part an industrial Nation where very recently mass production and fair relations between capital and labor served us

so well; that we should look upon labor and industry as a team pulling in the same direction, or as husband and wife where the give and take is not all on one side."

Crisis in Britain

It is difficult to exaggerate the gravity of the electricity shutdown in Britain. Forced by an acute coal shortage in the midst of an unusually severe winter, it may continue in effect for as long as two weeks. Besides imposing a daytime loss of power facilities on homes, shops, restaurants, office buildings, theaters, etc., it means that a vast segment of industry will be paralyzed and millions thrown out of work at a moment when the British are desperately in need of more and more production to avoid an economic collapse.

The critical nature of the situation is emphasized in the darkest terms by the leaders of all Britain's political groups. Anthony Eden, speaking for the Conservative Opposition, says there has been nothing like it since the grim days of the general strike twenty years ago. Emmanuel Shinwell, Prime Minister Attlee's Minister of Fuel and Power, declares flatly that unless domestic and industrial consumers co-operate fully in the emergency, the country will suffer "complete disaster" within a fortnight. Indeed, according to Attorney General Sir Hartley Shawcross, if the crisis is not overcome, the Labor government will fall and "there will be an end to any idea of socialism in our time."

Sir Hartley's suggestion is not overdrawn. Should the crisis deepen and get out of hand, the Opposition might call a vote of censure and force a general election. Right now the situation is being blamed chiefly on Mr. Shinwell, but the Attlee government as a whole is in a politically unenviable position. Figures indicate that it has succeeded in increasing coal production since nationalizing the mines, but this is overshadowed by evidence of serious bureaucratic fumbling and a marked lack of foresight in building up backlogs of fuel to meet at least the minimum needs of this winter. In the circumstances, even though the same emergency might have developed under the Conservatives, the Labor government conceivably could be forced out.

As Sir Hartley declares, however, the all-important thing at stake in Britain's crisis is not the fate of this or that political party but "the whole prosperity and future of the country." The British must export to live. They must sell goods of all kinds to all parts of the world in order to buy the vast quantities of food, raw materials and other imports they need to support their domestic economy. To do this they must produce as never before in their history. Terribly hard hit by the war, handicapped by a serious manpower shortage and suffering from the psychological impact of long years of privation and self-denial, they face a tough-and-go situation under the best of conditions. Considering all this, their current industrial paralysis—causing a dangerous loss of precious output—represents a blow of the first magnitude.

It does not seem too much to say that the situation thus adds up to a kind of economic Dunkirk for the British. All free men must hope that they will surmount it, just as they did the military one. Otherwise, should their economy have in the consequences would be far-reaching throughout the world, particularly in terms of the political and economic balance of power between democracy and totalitarianism under the developing new peace system.

Reciprocity Compromise

In their important joint statement on the subject, Senators Vandenberg and Millikin have taken a timely step to dissuade their fellow Republicans from any action likely to undermine our reciprocal trade program.

The significance of the statement rests in two facts. First of these is that more than a few Republicans in Congress seem eager to return to an era of high protective tariffs and that if they make an issue of it at this time they will split their party in the Senate and House. The second fact is that reciprocal trade is one of the key parts of our foreign economic policy and that we are slated to negotiate over it with eighteen other nations in April. If it should be undermined in the meantime, our Government would be placed in a peculiarly embarrassing position, and the whole world would have reason to doubt the bipartisan nature of our approach to international affairs.

Accordingly, Senators Vandenberg and Millikin have suggested a kind of compromise formula. They would have Congress defer all action on the reciprocity program until it comes up for legislative renewal next year. Meanwhile, they would have the President make certain changes in the program's operation, as he is empowered to do by law. These changes would subject all future reciprocal agreements to "escape clauses" and reviews and public hearings under which the United States Tariff Commission would directly advise the President to rule out, withdraw or modify any concessions likely to be harmful to our domestic economy.

These proposals, as Senators Vandenberg and Millikin declare, are designed to "allay many of the fears that have been mentioned" by opponents of reciprocity. At the same time, although calling for procedural changes, they would not hamper the "negotiation of agreements to encourage the essential expansion of our foreign trade."

Coming as they do after long discussions with Undersecretaries of State Acheson and Clayton, they constitute a sound and reasonable compromise, and in all probability the President will accept them.

It remains to be seen, however, whether the antireciprocify Republicans in the Senate and House will do the same. As one of the program's foes, Senator Taft has advised them against taking hostile action now, on the ground that it could get nowhere against the President's veto. If they go ahead and act anyhow, they will be weakening our hand abroad and obstructing all plans for an expanding world economy.

Washington As a Host

That Washington rapidly is recovering from the effects of the hectic war years of overcrowded hotels, restricted travel and convention taboos is evidenced by the activity these days at headquarters of the Board of Trade's Greater National Capital Committee.

The committee has just prepared a list of more than seventy-five important conventions to be held here this year, some of them international in scope. And the list is not complete. Included among the organizations which have scheduled meetings here are a number which will bring to the National Capital some of the outstanding professional and business leaders of the country. Scientists, industrial magnates, editors, sociologists, educators, representatives, in fact, of nearly every phase of our national life will come here from all parts of the Nation to consult with one another and, incidentally, to enjoy the hospitality of their National Capital.

It is only natural that Washington should be the mecca of so many convention-goers. No other city offers the opportunity of first-hand contact with all the Federal agencies, combined with the pleasures of sightseeing at the Seat of Government. Only one thing is lacking to make the picture complete. That is an auditorium capable of handling the largest conventions and expositions. Until this deficiency is met, Washington cannot do full justice to the role which the Greater National Capital Committee envisions for it as "host to the Nation."

One of the biggest businesses in the world is the production and distribution of whodunits. But it is only the imaginary kinds of crimes that really pay. Professional scallywags commonly are a poor lot of beggars.

This and That

By Charles E. Tracewell.

"TWENTIETH STREET.

"Dear Sir:
"Every spring I see mockingbirds in pairs do a little dance that must be courtship.

"The birds face each other with about a foot and a half between them, and, each keeping his eye firmly on the other, they move backward and forward, to the side, in opposite directions, and then together again, in graceful short hops.

"This goes on for several minutes in the present fashion, and then they get distracted by food, or fly away. But the little minutest is beautiful to behold. "Do many birds 'dance' in the spring, or is this peculiar to the mocker?"

"Very sincerely, A. H. E."

A number of species of birds indulge in actions which might be called "dancing," but few do it so well as our mockingbirds.

Sometimes they do this dancing in the dead of winter, so it may be a matter of wonder whether it is altogether a sex manifestation, in any real sense.

Many instances of this mocker peculiarity have been reported here, and many persons have seen it, but there still remain many bird watchers to which it is unknown.

It may be regarded, then, as characteristic, but not common, to the mocker. For instance, we have had mockingbirds in our yard every year, especially in winter, but have never seen any of them dancing.

The mocker is a great favorite of most persons.

He is a bird of character, so that it is impossible to ignore him.

At first, the observer may like him, or not like him, according to what the creature does, but there is no way of ignoring him.

This mocker receives scores of letters each year about mockers, perhaps as many as about any other species, and not all of them are favorable.

The trait which irks many watchers is the bird's propensity to chase other species away from bird feeding stations.

This is not motivated, in any case, by desire for food, for the bird does not seem to want to eat, or cannot eat the hard seeds and grains put out for other species.

He simply does not want the others to eat, and so chases them away.

The remedy for this is to put out such foods as mockers really like in another part of the yard, preferably on the other side of the house.

Raisins, doughnuts and apples supply the bill.

But in case this fare does not appeal, there is not much to do except to wait until the mockingbird gets tired of his sport, which he usually does in a few days or a few weeks, depending upon his persistence.

After all, he has something else to do in life, and especially he must eat, and in between his raids the other birds can come in and feed.

While these belligerent specimens manage to get the greatest share of attention, they are by no means the only sort of mockingbirds we have in winter.

Mainly these birds are pleasant, well behaved and great favorites. It is especially interesting to lure them to a porch rail, along which raisins have been sprinkled.

Then the true beauty of these gray fellows may be studied at close range. This is a marvelous bird, from any artistic viewpoint. He is a symphony in grays, with some white showing when he flies. His face has a sweet character, his eyes close up. The eyes are mild, even, and the cheeks somehow manage to augment the general character of the bird. With his streak of belligerence, especially at nesting time, when he will not hesitate to attack dog or cat, or even human being, and his trait of singing all night when the moon shines, he is one of America's favorite birds. Washington and vicinity are fortunate to have him the year around.

Letters to The Star

Sees 'Hapsburg Clause' in Treaty With Austria a Danger

To the Editor of The Star:
According to a recent report of the Associated Press from London, the delegates of the United States to the conference for the preparation of a treaty with Austria have proposed to include in that treaty a clause prohibiting the restoration of the Hapsburg monarchy. But the question of the restoration of the Hapsburgs to the Austrian throne does not possess any immediate actuality. Although a considerable part of the Austrian nation, particularly persons among the constituency of the conservative People's Party, may preserve feelings of allegiance to their old dynasty, no responsible Austrian politician thinks of raising fundamental constitutional questions under the present dire necessities of the country. The existing federal and republican constitution is recognized by all Austrian parties as a basis for co-operation to heal the wounds inflicted by war and foreign domination. However, the insertion of a "Hapsburg clause" into a treaty which is intended to establish Austria's independence as a keystone of peace in Central Europe soon may produce very contrary effects.

Interference Held Un-American.

First of all, interference with the internal constitutional affairs of another nation contradicts the traditional attitude of this country, which President Monroe formulated in his famous message: "Our policy in regard to Europe . . . is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us." Before Monroe the great democrat Thomas Jefferson had written in 1793 to the American minister in Paris: "We surely cannot deny to any nation that right whereon our own Government is founded—that every one may govern itself to whatever form it pleases." In the Atlantic Charter President Roosevelt declared, together with Prime Minister Churchill, that the United States and Great Britain "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live." The same principle is embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

Regarding Austria, there is no visible interest of the United States involved to restrict internal self-determination, as this may be in the cases of the aggressor nations, Germany and Japan. The Department of State has declared its view of Austria as "a country liberated from forcible domination by Nazi Germany and not an ex-enemy state." Right of internal self-determination remains unbridled in the peace treaties with Italy, Rumania and other satellite enemy nations.

Austria a Friendly State.

As to the Hapsburgs, who ceased to rule Austria in 1918, they had no connection whatever with Hitler's war, except that they had to flee from Europe and that their property in Austria was confiscated by the Nazi invaders. Members of the former reigning family of Austria took refuge in this country during the war and their head was received in a friendly manner by President Roosevelt.

For the Austrian people, any denial of their inherent right to frame their constitution as they may choose can result only in a weakening of their faith in an independent national existence. Pan-Germans would take new advantage of this, as many Austrians—adherents of the republican as well as of the monarchical form of government—will remember Hitler's assertion of Austria's independence to be only a tool to make her people tributary to foreign interests. Indeed, this would be the most serious aspect of the problem—not Austria's independence, but its proposed infringement. The treaty with Austria will be signed also by Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and other East European states. Allegiance to the Hapsburgs will not die out so soon among a part of the Austrians. This may lead from time to time to manifestations.

Unless the Allies renounce securing for Austria "fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression," as stipulated in the peace treaties with the other nations.

Risk of Communist Absorption.

A "Hapsburg clause" inserted into the Austrian treaty might give a title of intervention in the domestic affairs of Austria to any signatory power whenever this power might deem it proper to utilize it. Causes of interference would be found if they are only desired and looked for. Ultimately that clause would be instrumental in forcing the Austrian nation into the Communist-Slav bloc.

The initiative taken in London aiming at a denial to the Austrian people of its fundamental freedom to determine its form of government is inconsistent with American ideals. Besides there may be many an American who will challenge the wisdom of surrendering a valuable diplomatic instrument to powers which might use it to combat American interests in a strategic nerve center of Europe.

PREF. BERGER, JUD. Pol. Sc. D. Professor of International Law and Government at the Catholic University of America.

Worker on Portal Argument

To the Editor of The Star:

Every action has a reaction.

It is interesting to note the reaction of the portal-to-portal suits on the intelligent workman.

When going to Washington on Wednesday on the early morning train, I sat beside a nice looking young worker, going to Wilmington, with his lunch box in his hand. His idea of the above suits was that if they were approved by the courts.

First: It would tend to materially destroy the general economy of the Nation.

Second: It would make all prices of goods and services so high that the workman would be unable to buy.

EDWARD LOWBER STOKES.

Appreciation From Arlington

To the Editor of The Star:

Please accept the sincere thanks of the Arlington Chapter of the Infantile Paralysis Foundation for your splendid co-operation and help in connection with our recent solicitation of funds. Your local representative assisted in every way and largely contributed to our success.

CHARLES R. FENWICK, Chairman, Publicity Committee.

Or Good Taste

From the Richmond News-Leader.

Imagination makes value. You can't tell a real gem from a synthetic one except by checking the wearer's bankroll.

Have We Learned Our Lesson?

Universal Military Training, Says a Seasoned Diplomatist, Is Our Best Guarantee of Continued Peace

By Joseph C. Grew

Formerly Ambassador to Japan and Undersecretary of State

(Reprinted with some condensation by permission of the magazine Logistics.)

The preservation of international peace is a subject which has been the paramount issue in the thinking and striving of thoughtful men and women everywhere today, and it is not oversteating the case to say that on the success of our efforts will depend not only the future welfare of humanity but perhaps even the future existence of the majority of mankind.

In approaching this most perilous subject, our thinking will be clarified if we proceed from the basic fact that the great wars of this and the last generation were not caused by any lack of knowledge about the world, but by a lack of understanding about the world. They were led up to and brought about through the spread of hatred and lies by small groups of fanatical men holding the reins of power and lusting for greater power.

In my intimate experience with foreign affairs over a period of more than forty years, I have often had occasion to consider the close analogy between the problems of international relations and the problems presented in the field of medicine and surgery. In an address before the American Medical Association in Tokyo in 1933, I compared our international ills with the ravages of insidious disease, especially cancer, which often begins on a small scale as a result of long irritation on a given spot. Here the physician must seek to eradicate the disease by curative treatment long before operation becomes unavoidable, and in that connection I visualized at some time in the future the establishment of a sort of Faculty of International Political Health which would sit constantly studying international relationships from every point of view, much as the family physician studies his individual charges, prescribing from time to time the needed treatment.

An Alternative to World Chaos.

At last I am encouraged to believe that my flight of fancy was not so far-fetched and that it is being realized, especially in the creation of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. That "Faculty of International Political Health" is today a going concern. Its founders profited by the lessons and experience of the League of Nations; its members will contribute to the world's peace and well-being, and only a hopeless philosophy would predict that whatever may be its future mistakes, and however grave its future failures, the United Nations will not grow into a full and complete world peace, for the alternative is world chaos.

In the meantime, how shall we, the people, act in the situation that confronts us today? What insurance can we take against future international wars? I list four basic concepts, and as an American I address these concepts to our own people although they apply in varying degree to peace-loving peoples everywhere.

First, the spread of education—universal, liberal, untrammeled education. That is one of the highest of all goals, most devoutly to be sought, for only through the dissemination of truth can permanent international peace be ensured. In this I feel that spiritual truth is a fundamental factor.

Second, a willingness to face hard, cold, disagreeable facts. We can afford to and we must hold our idealism and our principles high, but we must keep our feet firmly planted on the ground and not be afraid to recognize those facts and to call a spade a spade. This is no time for moral anaesthesia. We in America have played the ostrich all too much in times past, burying our heads in the sand, refusing to see and accept what was right before our eyes, and refusing to take common sense measures on the basis of factual estimates. The lessons of history have been all too soon forgotten. I do not see how we or any other peace-loving nation can, in this day and age, stand by while other peoples are absorbed in totalitarian conquest, their basic liberties suffocated, their hopes for a better future rubbed out. World peace cannot be preserved on any such basis.

Third, there must follow a willingness on the part of the American people to accept the responsibility of leadership which that responsibility imposes. Short-sighted improvisation of our foreign policy on the basis of expediency rather than shaping it on sound principle in building a lasting peace. It must be a positive, not a negative policy. Our contribution to world peace must be a clear-cut blueprint, subject to adjustment but not to fundamental change.

A Vital Form of Insurance.

Fourth, a vital measure of insurance is preparedness, for preparedness by the nonaggressive democracies is the most effective of all guarantees against world war.

Not long ago the United States News asked me to express my opinion, yes or no, on the extension of the selective service draft. Here it is:

Had Great Britain been adequately prepared in 1914 and had Sir Edward

Grey told the Germans unequivocally that if they attacked Belgium, Great Britain would declare war within an hour, it is a fair hypothesis that the first world war would never have occurred. Had the United States been adequately prepared in 1941, it is a fair hypothesis that Japan would never have attacked. For preparedness at present the only insurance against war. Without preparedness, diplomacy, our first line of national defense, is bankrupt.

Let us do everything in our power to support the United Nations in its enlightened efforts to ensure a world which will be a world in which the United Nations develops to a point where it commands our full confidence that it can prevent war, it would be the height of folly to let down our guard.

That the atomic bomb will, in our generation, render the gun and knives obsolete is a highly dangerous and illogical concept on which to gamble our national security.

That is why the extension of the Selective Service draft for another year for our national defense is plain, common sense. It is a matter of time, but that is not enough. A year ago last June I had the privilege of opening the hearings before the Congressional Committee on Postwar Military Policy on the proposed plan for compulsory military training for our youth, and in November 1945 I testified on the same subject before the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. I testified emphatically in favor of that plan. The subject then under discussion is coming up in due course and I feel strongly that every citizen should be thinking about it and debating it in his mind, prepared to take a position when the time comes.

On May 8, 1945, Germany surrendered. On September 1, 1945, Japan surrendered. What a profound satisfaction it would be if we could now lay aside our arms with the certainty assured by the fact that we have never again seen the like of that which we did in 1918. In 1941 we were taught a bitter lesson as a result of that belief and that action. Have our people not learned that lesson?

I believe that they have done so. I am confident that our people will ever again—at least in our lifetime—do as we did after 1918.

There Isn't Much Time.

In any case, it is idle to make comparisons with 1918. The world today is a far different place. Science, while annihilating space, has produced power undreamed of in the past. Science will still produce engines of war undreamed of today. Yet for every weapon of offense, science will endeavor to develop weapons of defense, and weapons, whether of offense or defense, can be used effectively only by trained men. Indeed, trained manpower for the production of our armaments will be precisely as essential in the future as it has been in the past. We cannot afford to wait.

The answer to the problem is, of course, that war must go—forever. But that great objective cannot, alone, be enough. The pessimists or the realists, as you will, may hold that this objective can never be attained. They will point to the fact that wars, as I have said, are not made by nations but are prepared and ultimately commenced by small groups of men, the few who are in control of the military, not subject to the will of the people. Against that we have the mighty potential bulwark of the United Nations, which we should do everything in our power to help develop to a point where it can command our full confidence and trust against future wars of aggression. But until the United Nations has developed to a point where it can command our confidence, it would, I repeat—and it cannot be repeated too often—be the height of folly to jeopardize our national security by relaxing our very freedom, by letting down our guard in the years ahead.

If during those years before Pearl Harbor we had had available this great proposed reserve of young men, expertly trained for war if war should come, and as well as a two-ocean Navy, and if we had told the Japanese in no uncertain terms that the American people proposed to use this available trained power if need be, who can say whether the Japanese hot-headed military extremists might not have been deterred by the same elements in that misguided country from ever attacking us?

I believe in the lessons of history. For the present at least, and probably for long to come, we need to take out an insurance policy against war, and the best insurance I can conceive is the effectuation, in close co-operation with and effective support of the United Nations world organization, of this plan for military training for our young men. And that training will be largely technical, not merely shouldering arms. Preparedness for war is the most powerful argument for peace that man has ever been able to devise. Let us keep our high idealism—all of it—but let us look facts in the face.

On the Record

By Dorothy Thompson

Our gestures in Poland seem rather ambiguous and coy. Our ambassador, doubtless acting on Washington's instructions, first refrains from attending the opening of the new Polish Parliament. This is done to indicate that the United States does not believe the January elections created a representative body, and the gesture is noted.

But then he congratulates President Bierut on his re-election as President, though it is the unrepresentative and— from our viewpoint—illegal body which has re-elected him. This might be confusing to the Polish people. A generally aloof demeanor all along the line would have seemed more coherent and consistent for whatever good it might have done.

The new cabinet is headed by Premier Josef Cyrankiewicz, one of the fusion socialists in the new Polish democratic bloc. Most critics of the bloc think he is better than Mr. Oubka-Morawski, whom he supplants. Mr. Oubka-Morawski takes over the ministry of public administration.

Mr. Cyrankiewicz, with whom I talked on the day I left Poland, is not satisfied with the state of affairs. There is still too much of the old Social Democratic tradition. He would like to see Poland restored to the reign of law. He will not contradict you if you say flatly that there is no law worth the name in Poland today.

Nor will he say no if you advance the proposition that three things are necessary for the real consolidation and pacification of Poland. These are: The elimination of personalities who are universally believed to be Moscow quislings; the securing of the security police into an arm of the law and not of the party bloc; and the creation of

Basic Americanism

Seen Goal of House

Tenure Vote Shows Democrats From South Back GOP

By David Lawrence

There are public questions that cut deeper than political party lines nowadays and it appears there is now a two-thirds majority in the House of Representatives in favor of fundamental Americanism.

The test came on the proposal to submit to the people a constitutional amendment to limit presidential tenure to two terms. When it is considered that 47 Democrats voted with the solid Republican membership of the House to make a total of more than the necessary two-thirds, it is clear that New Dealism is definitely on the wane.

The issue presented could have been regarded as partisan—in fact, 121 Democrats who voted against it have been considered it so—but the fact that 47 Democrats were not swayed by the New Deal type of argument is a hopeful augury of the future.

The Republicans have been having their troubles getting organized and it has been suggested in many quarters, where the wish is father to the thought, that the Republicans are splitting apart. Nevertheless, not a single Republican vote was cast against the proposed amendment to the Constitution. Much more important, however, is the evidence that a substantial number of Democrats will join the Republicans on important issues to override a veto whenever a fundamental issue of Americanism is at stake.

Many of these Democrats come from the South, where the fires of the Washington and Jefferson tradition still burn brightly. These Democrats will be found voting with their Republican brethren from the North on issues involving fundamentals.

Northern Democrats Scared.

Such issues will arise when the big challenge of monopoly comes. For the Northern Democrats have to a large extent become the party of special privilege and monopoly. The anxiety of certain Northern Democrats to protect the "closed shop" monopoly and the effort being made to allow the Wagner Act to go unrevoked, so that the labor vote can be maintained by those Northern Democrats in the large cities, are reminiscent of the alliances that the reactionary Republicans used to make with business and financial interests to maintain special privileges on the tariff in exchange for campaign aid.

It is the Republican Party which now has the chance to earn the plaudits of the vast number of Americans who want a fair deal instead of the New Deal, and who want the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government kept free from the collectivist doctrines which have swept Europe.

Whether presented under the name of public ownership or state socialism or communism or fascism, or at times under the much abused term "liberalism," the tendency toward making the central government the master rather than the servant of the citizen is the same. The trend toward removal from the individual of his right to work and earn a livelihood has been growing in the last decade under New Dealism.

Worker Must Pay Tribute.

Today national unions have a system of law all their own, and a worker who is trained in a trade cannot get a job unless he is willing to pay tribute to such a union. It is surprising to find a liberal of former Gov. Stassen's understanding of free government: speaking words of tolerance for the "closed shop" monopoly, even on the expedient ground that its abolition would add to labor-management friction.

Sooner or later, the issue of the "closed shop" has to be faced, because, if legalized by custom, it means that a group of private citizens can make the laws and deprive individuals of their right to work. This is so contrary to American tradition that, on the "closed shop" issue, it may be taken for granted that a coalition of Republicans and Democrats will vote against such a monopolistic practice whenever the opportunity arises in a test vote.

The special privileges which have been given to national labor unions transcend by far any that the corporations ever had in the heyday of their power. The present Republican Congress was elected on a mandate of liberalism, which means that the people want no authority set up that can paralyze the sources of food distribution or impair their opportunity